

of a talk I made to the Clinton (S.C.) Kiwanis Club's annual farmers night program, April 14, 1960:

FARM PROGRAM

(Address of Congressman WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DOAN at Kiwanis Club's annual farmers night, April 14, at Clinton, S.C.)

The most serious domestic problem facing the people of the United States is the farm situation. Farm population in the United States has dropped to 11 percent of the total, the lowest percentage in the history of the United States and the lowest of any major world power in the history of the world. This is a dangerously low percentage.

The United States was founded by men with a rural philosophy. The Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights were largely written by rural men. Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe were all outstanding farmers. The fact that Washington and Jefferson were great farmers made them good Presidents. Nearly all of the Presidents in the history of the United States were born and reared on a farm or associated with a farm. The membership of the Congress for 130 years was overwhelmingly rural. Farmers have initiative. They are independent. They think for themselves. They cannot be herded or coerced to the polls by goons and ward bosses. It is difficult to get up a mob or overthrow the Government with busy, contented landowning farmers. A man who is busy milking cows and tilling the soil is not going to lead a march on the Nation's Capitol to overthrow representative government.

We do not find Communists and Socialists engaged in the pursuit of agriculture. Our rural areas are no breeding ground for juvenile delinquency. Rural people go to church and support good schools. The rural home is the bedrock of a democratic society.

Under the price-support and acreage-control programs, the American family-size farmer has been reduced to a state of peonage. One-half of the burley-tobacco growers in the United States, under this Government program, are permitted only one-half acre or less—in a nation that originated the culture of tobacco. Under these Government programs, cotton acreage has fallen off in the United States 60 percent since 1930. We have lost cotton markets at home and abroad. One-third of the cotton farmers in the United States grow 5 acres or less. The percentage is even greater in the Southeast. It is impossible for a farmer to clothe, support, and send his children to college with less than 5 acres of cotton or one-half acre of tobacco.

What opportunity is there for a young man with an ambition to be a farmer? He cannot possibly become a farmer unless he inherits a farm or marries into one with allotted acres. Farming is the only business in this so-called free nation that a young man cannot go into—he is not permitted to do so by a government of free people. Under these Government programs, the situation gets worse and worse. Surpluses mount and the rural population decreases, with more and more people on the welfare rolls and more looking to Washington paternalism.

These farm programs could not have served Russia's purpose more if they had been written by the Kremlin's planners of world conquest. America's population is being concentrated in the great cities, easy to annihilate with the atomic bomb, easy to herd into political machines, and easily subjected to propaganda and agitation. In fact, the first farm program inaugurated in the United States was written by questionable characters—one of whom has since served a term in the penitentiary. The farm program was written by Alger Hiss, Nathan Witt, Frank Shea, Rex Tugwell, Lee Pressman, Henry A. Wallace, and Felix Frankfurter, presently a Justice of this notorious U.S. Supreme Court.

These were principally bright young attorneys, most of whom knew nothing whatever about agriculture.

Under the programs these men inaugurated, we grow less and less, our farm population shrinks, while Russia grows more and more and every nation in the world increases her farm acreage. Soviet Russia since 1955 has added over 100 million new acres to agricultural production. Rhodesia exempts her farmers from land taxes to grow more and more. Turkey exempts her farmers from income taxes to grow more and more. In this country we passed a soil bank to get our farmers to grow less and less. Incidentally, the average farmer in Rhodesia plants 65 acres of tobacco; in Canada, 30 acres; and in the United States, may I repeat, half of the tobacco farmers are permitted to plant only one-half acre or less. The same is true with cotton and wheat. Foreign nations grow more, with American foreign aid, while we grow less. We send them marketing experts, fertilizer experts, and the net result is to put our own people out of business.

Under the cotton price-support loan program, in the year 1958 358 farmers in the State of California received \$50,000 or more; Arizona, 194; Mississippi, 237; South Carolina, 1; Georgia, none; North Carolina, 2; Alabama, none. Here in the Southeast we are not only being forced and tricked off the land, but we are paying the bill for others to become bigger and bigger. The atmosphere is being carefully created so that someday a campaign of land reform will explode in the United States along the lines of China's and Cuba's agrarian reform. The only segments of our farm economy holding its own, growing, free, and with hope, are those outside of Government control and price supports—for example, livestock, pine trees, citrus fruits, and vegetables.

On my farm I grow beef, pine trees, and grass, because I can do so without Government regulation.

The pressure was put on Congress to put price supports on livestock, but I am so glad today we resisted these pressure groups. The beef surplus simply vanished through increased consumption. Livestock today accounts for 54 percent of the farm income.

Yes, we need a farm program, a new farm program, a positive program, one that looks to the future, one that will offer hope to the youth of this country, one that will beckon to the teeming millions in the crowded cities, one that can assure us food and part-time employment for the unemployed during times of depression.

1. The No. 1 plank in this farm program should be gradual elimination of price supports and all acreage controls. Our free Nation cannot long survive as long as its farm population is regimented, controlled, and paid to do less and become weaker.

2. The Government subsidizes certain business operations to stay in business, to expand, grow, and to employ more people. On the other hand, we subsidize the farmer to plant less and less, to employ fewer people and to buy less fertilizer, machinery, and supplies. We are simply paying him directly to go out of business. It would be much better for the Nation if we paid the farmer to grow more, not less, and if we paid him directly to stay on the farm instead of moving toward the overcrowded cities.

3. Get rid of the surplus by promoting markets abroad and expanding our markets at home.

4. Develop new crops and new uses through expanded research and advertising. Dr. Herty kept thousands of farmers in business by research on the pine tree.

5. Expand the rural development program.

6. Give the farmer more Federal tax advantages so he can compete with the tax exempt farmers of foreign nations. Give him a break with local taxes by making him pay less for improved rural property. The

policy now is to tax a farmer if he paints his house and improves the appearance of his farm. The local taxes on many farmers have doubled since improving his place by sheer initiative and effort.

7. Imports—the farm problem could be solved in one stroke by prohibiting imports of livestock, cotton gins, and other farm commodities we already have in surplus. Over 100 million new acres could be used in the United States to produce the beef, wool, sugar, cotton, tobacco, grain, and other farm commodities now imported from foreign countries.

South Carolina needs a new industry, but more than anything else we need to save our old industry which consumes cotton from our farms. We need a new industry, but we also need a South Carolina Planning and Development Board for agriculture. South Carolina's agricultural development must keep pace with its industrial development. It will be tragic for the future political and social welfare of our State if we become all industrial. We must have a balanced economy. We must preserve our South Carolina rural heritage, traditions and philosophy.

We have a great agricultural college at Clemson. Clemson's agricultural program needs the full support and backing of all of our citizens, both urban and rural.

Through research and planning, South Carolina was able to switch from indigo to rice, to cotton, and now to livestock and pine trees. South Carolina must and can continue to be largely agricultural.

Joint Congress file
Congress Should Take a Look at CIA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1960

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the events of the past week on the international scene are highly disturbing. They point out dramatically that in the delicate state of relations between the nations of the world it is necessary to maintain the highest degree of responsibility in all actions we take that might affect our international relations.

Mr. Speaker, in view of these recent developments I want to join with others in expressing the hope that Congress will take a look at the CIA and its operations in the public interest as suggested in the editorial of the Nashville Tennessean of May 11 which I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the Record. The editorial follows:

IF CIA CHIEF IS ON HIS OWN CONGRESS SHOULD TAKE A LOOK

Days after the spy plane debacle in Russia, the truth is beginning to come out in Washington, and to that extent the United States position is being improved.

Having been mouse-trapped by Mr. Khrushchev, Secretary Hester has clarified the question of authority in the gathering mission which came to such a calamitous end.

The broad policy of aerial espionage, we are told, came from President Eisenhower, acting in accord with the National Security Act of 1947. Since the beginning of his administration, Mr. Hester said, the President has put into effect directives "to gather by every means possible the information required to protect the United States and the free world against surprise attack and to

A4164

enable them to make effective preparations for their defense."

Under the President's directives, therefore, various programs have been carried out, including "extensive aerial surveillance by unarmed aircraft," it is revealed. In a burst of candor, it is emphasized that flights over and near Russia will continue as needed.

The earlier claim that there was no responsibility for the U-2 flight as far as Washington was concerned, thus is revealed as double-talk and subterfuge of a kind that has impaired the administration's claim to open dealing in international matters.

We can believe that the President did not press the bottom, as it were, for this particular flight, and that brings up the question of how uncontrolled the Central Intelligence Agency may be just before the summit.

If Mr. Allen Dulles, head of CIA, has not been called on the carpet for his part in the colossal blunder, it would be surprising. For it is obvious that even if he had not been told to cease his activities lest the summit be wrecked, he should have acted to this end on his own.

Yet there is a good deal of evidence that when Mr. Dulles acts on his own judgment, he is very apt to be wrong. Along with General MacArthur, he is charged with having goofed on the Chinese Communist participation in Korea, and his organization allegedly was taken by surprise when Nasser seized the Suez Canal. Other instances of missed signals could be listed.

Regardless, therefore, of whether Mr. Dulles becomes the goat of this particular blunder, there is ample reason for Congress to revive the proposal that a permanent joint committee be established to make continuing studies of the CIA's secret activities, for which it is not accountable to the body which created it and appropriates operating funds estimated at from \$100 million to \$1 billion annually.

While there is general fear lest mistakes lead to nuclear war, a free-wheeling intelligence agency calls for some sort of scrutiny and direction.

Confidence in White House direction has been hard hit by the latest turn of events. And for this development Columnist James Reston of the New York Times has a simple explanation:

"He [the President] is not even managing his own departments preliminary to the summit, and this, of course, is precisely the trouble."

Insofar as it can help correct this strange situation, the Congress has every right and reason for investigating to the fullest.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of May 14, 1960:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, May 14, 1960)

The Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, just enacted, presented the contradictory though not too unusual spectacle of Congressmen debating and agreeing to the expenditure of public money for a program that practically everyone, for varying reasons, thought wrong, yet the bill passed

handily without a record vote. The bill called for approximately \$4 billion in various agriculture subsidies. The Appropriation Committee's own report on the bill highlights the inconsistencies. Here are some quotes: "The Federal Government is now spending far more in the name of agriculture than ever before in history * * * yet farm income in 1959 was at the lowest level since World War II. * * * Since 1953 the following 'cures' have been offered, tried, and from the record found wanting, so far as solving the problem is concerned." Then are listed reduced price supports (lower assured prices), soil bank (to pay farmers for acreage left untilled), Public Law 480 (to give surpluses away at home and abroad), Agriculture Department personnel increase of 28 percent, appropriations increase of 300 percent, and production controls lowered (reduced acreage control). And still the problem remains unsolved. "The cost to the Federal Treasury since 1952 now totals \$25.8 billion. * * * Farmers tend to increase their production as farm prices are reduced."

The soil bank failed, according to the report, because we paid farmers for land that already lay idle; further, that if 56 percent of all farms were retired at \$10 per acre per year, costing us \$2.75 billion, we would cut production only 9 percent. The problem, as the report states, "will never be solved until Congress attacks the problem at its base, which is overproduction." The report then shows that the \$13.5 billion in food given away at home and abroad under Public Law 480 since 1954 has not eliminated the surpluses, but rather "has contributed to a constantly deteriorating situation for American agriculture by getting these huge surpluses out of sight abroad and thereby postponing action to prevent the increase in the surplus problem." Also, the report states that Public Law 480 "should be considered a foreign aid program and should be paid for in the mutual security bill." Speaking of acreage controls, the report states, "while efforts to control production through acreage controls have not been effective, it appears unwise to eliminate them." Under the heading, "Corrective Action Urgently Needed", we find, "the situation becomes progressively worse. * * * It is imperative the present approaches to this problem be reversed if the agricultural industry of this country is to survive and if we are to prevent a bankrupt agriculture from pulling down the rest of our economy." Yet the bill passed perpetuates the present programs.

The forthright report stopped just short of the truth. The truth is that Federal subsidy (Federal money and Federal control) will kill private enterprise ultimately. True, to a degree, industry can live on, through accumulated productive strength, against the debilitating Federal regulation, much as a ship moves despite barnacles. True, taxpayers can survive economically despite the weight of taxation much as a strong man can carry a heavy burden and still do other tasks. But in either case or in combination of the two, subsidy and taxation, free enterprise, private initiative, and individual freedom go down the drain. We are now witnessing the struggle of a dying, free industry, originally a free industry—agriculture—because of the Federal Government. The solution? Get the Federal Government out entirely. Only then can normal market supply and demand react and result in the right prices, which in turn will result in a good income to the farmer, balanced against the costs of other commodities. So the effort of Congress should be directed toward freeing the farmer, not regulating and subsidizing him deeper into trouble. The bill passed without a record vote. I voted against it and desire to be so recorded. I predict that if Congress will not take the statesmanlike position, then the people will force action,

just as happened in the labor reform bill, passed despite House leadership opposition. It would be better, and hurt the farmers less, it seems to me, if the Congress and the farm industry effected the changes voluntarily than to have it forced on them.

Russia's propagandistic blustering concerning the American "spy" was answered forthrightly by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee in a floor speech. Mr. CANNON pointed out our failure to anticipate the Communists' Korean attack which cost our own unready troops dearly. So it is that for 4 years CIA (Central Intelligence Agency) by design has been sending planes over Russia to observe in order to protect ourselves, so far as possible, against buildups for surprise attacks. He likened the appropriation of funds for this work to the secret atomic work at Oak Ridge which preceded the atom bomb, unknown to all but a few of the Members of Congress. Espionage is a part of modern warfare and survival. Ours is hardly comparable to Russia's infiltration and subversive efforts. It was a refreshing statement. Russia needs to be told once and for all that we are deadly serious in our intention to protect freedom-loving nations, and if they don't like it, that's just too bad. Tough and direct action is all that blusterers understand. Only as we are strong, tough-minded, and tough-talking, will we prevent war and strengthen and attract the only kind of allies we want, specifically those equally dedicated to preserving freedom for mankind against the godless, slave-state alternative of communism.

Pensions for World War I Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1960

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the time has now come when Congress must take action to fulfill its obligations to the veterans of World War I. A most important step toward obtaining a World War I pension is support from the major veterans' organizations. It will therefore be of great interest to the Members of Congress that Willamette Heights Post No. 102 and Ontario Post 67 of the American Legion and Willard Anderson Post 2471 of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, have endorsed the passage of a separate pension program for World War I veterans. Their resolutions follow:

RESOLUTION ASKING THAT THE AMERICAN LEGION GO ON RECORD AS SUPPORTING A SEPARATE PENSION FOR THE VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I

Whereas veterans of the First World War did not participate in the generous postwar benefits afforded veterans of World War II and Korea, nor comparably in social security or retirement, health and insurance plans which were not generally available prior to World War II; and

Whereas it does not seem fair to such veterans of World War I now of an average age level of 65 years, that they be lumped together with the younger veterans of later wars in a single pension program that does not take into consideration their particular needs as is the case with the War Pension Act of 1959; and

Whereas the veterans of First World War now number only a small segment of the